

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION

PLANNING COMMISSION

September 26, 1973

MINUTES

Members Present: Chairman Lucero, Jerry Wilds, Virginia Flager, Gene McEwen, Blake Chambliss, Jane Quimby and Robert Van Houten.

1. Approval of minutes of previous meeting:

The minutes were approved as mailed.

2. #48-73: Consider zoning of Goodwill Annex Petitioner: City of Grand Junction Location: E 1/2 of SE 1/4 of Sec. 18, T1S, R1E, UM. (The NW Corner of the intersection of Hwy 6 & 24 and 28 1/2 Road)

Chairman Lucero read the request, Mr. Cisar located the property. It is the recommendation of staff that the property be zoned I-1 (Light Industry) Mr. Lucero asked for comments from the audience, there were none. Mr. Chambliss made a motion to approve the zoning, Mr. Wilds seconded and it passed unanimously.

3. #35-73: Consider rezoning petition from R-2 to C-1.
Petitioner: Henry A. Blaylock
Location: Lots 21 thru 32, Block 10, City of Grand Junction. (The NE Corner of the intersection of Second St. and Belford Ave.)

Chairman Lucero read the request, Mr. Cisar located the property in question and explained the proposed plan. Mr. Lucero asked if there would be enough parking spaces. Mr. Cisar said that they are lacking 4 parking spaces to meet requirements. Mr. Blaylock was present and said that he plans to build 15 units. Mr. Lucero asked for opponents, there were none. Mr. Van Houten asked what was the purpose of this change, Mr. Engelke explained that with the present zoning, he couldn't build the additional units. Mr. Cisar said that the staff would like to see the property zoned PDB (Planned Business) because we would be able to see the proposed plans for the site and have some control over what was done. Mr. Chambliss expressed his concern for the use of so many bulk developments and the follow-thru on them. Mr. Blaylock stated that when he bought the property he was told that he could get it rezoned and build on the west half of the property. Mr. Lucero closed the hearing and a discussion by the board followed. Mr. Chambliss made a motion to recommend to council approval of a Planned Business Zone, Jane Quimby seconded and the motion passed unanimously. City of Grand Junction Planning Commission September 26, 1973 Page 2

١.

-

-

-

Consider rezoning petition involving 14 lots from P (Parking) and R-3 (Multi-family residence) to C-1 (Light Industry) zone. #46-73: Richard Sparkman & Mr. Cary Lots 21 thru 32, Block 3, City of Grand Junction. Petitioner: (The NE Location: Corner of the intersection of Ninth St. and Belford Ave.)

Mr. Lucero read the request and Mr. Cisar located the property. Mr. Sparkman explained what was planned. He wants to build an office and retail outlet. He also wants to enlarge the parking area and get some of the traffic off of the alley and to keep their trucks from parking on the street.

Mrs. Blamey and Mrs. Oliver, residents of the area, were present and expressed their concern over the added traffic problems with the expansion of the business.

Mr. Cisar stated that the board has no plan review on C-1 zoning. Only in a Planned Business zone can the board see the plan. Mr. Chambliss stated that the south side of Belford is a nice residential area and the board should be concerned that they don't cause problems for those residents. A discussion followed by the board. Mr. Lucero asked for comments. Mr. Harshman asked if curb cuts would be excluded on Belford, Mr. Lucero answered, no. The hearing was closed. Jane Quimby made a motion to rezone the area to Planned Business, Blake Chambliss seconded and the motion passed unanimously. Mrs. Blamey asked what the difference was between Light Commerce and Planned Business. Mr. Lucero said that we would have a public hearing to review the plans with a Planned Business zone.

5. #51-73: Consider rezoning petition involving 2.26 + acres from R-1-C (One Family Residential) to R-3 (Multi-family Residential) zoning.

Petitioner:

M. E. McCallister Lots 1 thru 5, Block 4, N.W. Smith Addition and that part Location: of Lot 33 in Fairmount Subdivision. (E of 13th St., S of the Grand Valley Canal and 125 feet N of Cedar Ave.)

Mr. Lucero read the request, Mr. Cisar located the property in question. Mr. McCallister stated that apartments are planned and would like about 30 units. Mrs. Priest, a resident of the area, was present and wanted

to know how this would effect her property. She doesn't want a high building to block her view. Mrs. Quimby asked Mr. McCallister if he had and plans for the property now and he answered, no. Mr. Lucero read a letter from the property owners giving Mr. McCallister power of attorney in this matter. Mr. Cisar said that the staff recommends that we look at a PUD so we would have site review. A PD8 would allow 8 units per acre and a compatable density with existing developments. Mr. Lucero asked for opponents, there were none and the hearing was closed.

A discussion by the board followed. Virginia Flager made a motion to change the zoning request to PD8, Bob Van Houten seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Grand Junction Planning Commission September 26, 1973 Page 3

ъ.

Location:

<u>#47-73:</u> Consider rezoning petition involving 15 lots from R-1-C (One Family Residence) to R-3 (Multi-family residence) zone Petitioner: Gale and Co.

Lots 1 thru 9, Block 4, and Lots 8 thru 13, Block 1, Teller Arms Sub. (South side of Hill Ave. from 24th St. to N. 26th St. and vacant lots on Hill)

St. and vacant lots on Hill) Mr. Lucero read the request, Mr. Cisar located the property and noted that there are approximately 3 acres of land involved. Mr. Gale was present and stated that the lots are 63'x125'. Mr. Van Houten excused himself from the board as he is a resident of this area and had comments to make as a resident. Mr. Gale stated that they are interested in a condominium type of project. The units will be primarily one bedroom in order to keep the population of the area down. This is the type of development where you are an owner of your unit. He stated that he is not opposed to PUD zoning. A discussion followed. Mr. Van Houten expressed his concern with the traffic problems in the area. He is opposed to the access of the area and not the project. Mr. Sam Samuelson and Mrs. Thompson, residents of the area were present and presented a petition (37) names signed by all adjacent property owners opposing the request. Mr. Lucero read a letter from Mr. & Mrs. Doughtery who are also residents of the area opposing the request. Traffic is the biggest concern of the residents.

Mr. Gale stated that as the property is presently zoned, it is dead ground. Proposed the possibility that 24th and 26th Streets be closed and force traffic onto Grand, 28 Road and North Ave. Mr. Dale Luke was present and explained what has happened over the years with the property. He pointed out that no one wants a single family home on these lots. The property won't sell as it is. Mr. Samuelson would like to see the R-3 area on Hill rezoned to R-1. Mr. Gale stated that he would like the opportunity to upgrade the property and enhance the area. Mr. Samuelson spoke on the water table problem in the area. Rick Cisar explained density on the PUD possibilities. Mr. Chambliss made a motion to table the request until an acceptable plan can be presented, Mr. McEwen asked if the board could have some traffic counts in the area. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion and it passed. Virginia Flager obstained from voting.

7. #50-73: Consider rezoning petition involving 12 lots from B-1 (Limited Business) to C-2 (Heavy Commerce) zoning.
Petitioner: Bob Gerlofs
Location: Lots 23 thru 34, Block 132, City of Grand Junction. (The NE Corner of the intersection of Eleventh St. and Ute Ave.

Mr. Lucero read the request and a letter from Mr. Gerlofs stating why he wouldn't be able to attend the meeting. Mr. Cisar described the property. Mr. Lucero asked for opponents, there were none. Mr. Engelke explained what had happened in the past. A discussion followed on the fact that there were no plans for the area. Mr. Van Houten made a motion to recommend to Council denial of the request, Virginia Flager seconded the the motion carried. Mr. Chambliss stated that the original zone change should be considered. About two years ago a zone change was granted and nothing was done with the property, so why are we considering a change again? Mrs. Gerlofs was present but had no information on what was proposed for the area. Grand Junction Planning Commission September 26, 1973 Page 4

Consider plat of Spring Valley Subdivision, First Filing involving 11.52 acres (24 Lots) with R-1-C (One family <u>#34-73</u>: Petitioner:

residence) zoning. Mr. & Mrs. W. L. Peach SE 1/4 of Sec. 1, T1S, R1W, UM. (286' N of Patterson Rd. and East of 27 1/2 Rd.) Location:

Mr. Lucero read the request, Mr. Cisar described the property in question. Mr. Lucero excused himself from discussion because his office is involved with this development. Virginia Flager acted as Chairman. Mr. Cisar outlined the conditions for approval on the plan and said that these conditions are being worked on. Virginia Flager asked for comments and there were none. Mr. Wilds asked if this plan has been approved by City departments. Mr. Cisar said yes, with minor changes and they are being worked on. A discussion followed by the board. Mr. McEwen made a motion to approve this request subject to the utility requirements and staff memo. Mr. Wilds seconded and it passed unanimously.

9. #49-73: Consider a request for a Revocable Permit for the installation of a street light. Mrs. D. W. Squirrell 812 Rood Ave., City of Grand Junction Petitioner: Location:

Mr. Lucero read the request, Mr. Cisar located the property. The request for a street light is for security reasons. There are female employees coming and going at all hours and more lighting is needed. This item has to go before the Commission because the light will be on city property. A discussion followed. Virginia Flager made a motion to approve the request, Mr. Van Houten seconded and it passed unanimously.

10. General Discussion:

- Mr. Gene Hanson was present to discuss Wellington Gardens. The complex 1. needs some storage area and the recreation area needs to be improved. They would like to put in a couple of tennis courts and perhaps, bikeways. His partners are interested in changing to a condominium development. A discussion by the board followed. Mr. Cisar pointed out that any change in open space or addition of buildings would have to come back before the board for approval.
- Mr. Chambliss informed the Board of a meeting on October 31, November 2. It is a State Planning meeting. 1 and 2 at Estes Park.
- •3. There was a discussion on a bus system for Grand Junction. This is a provate project of Mr. Van Houten's.
- 4. The board discussed a City Subdivision Regulations work session to be scheduled for October.

ADJOURNMENT:

On a motion made by Mr. Van Houten and seconded by Mr. Chambliss, the meeting was adjourned.